

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are now pending in the application. Claim 6 is cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0093480) in view of Glen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,083). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 5, Mizutani, either singly or in combination with Glen, fails to show, teach, or suggest the data driver and the scan driver being set to a sleep mode when a predetermined frame period elapsed after the second frame period ends if the display stopping signal is a sleep signal.

It is a longstanding rule that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1974), see MPEP §2143.03. Furthermore, when evaluating claims for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, all of the limitations must be considered and given weight. *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), MPEP § 2144.03. Here, the cited combination fails to disclose the limitation of **setting the data driver and the scan driver to a sleep mode when a predetermined frame period elapsed after the second frame period ends if the display stopping signal is a sleep signal.**

Applicant respectfully submit that claim 5, as well as its dependent claims, should be allowable for at least the above reasons.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1-4 and 9-11 are allowed. The Examiner states that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant amended claim 5 to incorporate the allowable subject matter from claim 6. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5, as well as its dependent claims, should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2008

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/DMA/rao